



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/752,274	12/29/2000	Rachel S. Lieberman	60709-00019	9133

7590 03/24/2006
John S. Beulick
Armstrong Teasdale LLP
One Metropolitan Sq., Suite 2600
St. Louis, MO 63102

EXAMINER

FRENEL, VANEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/752,274	Applicant(s) LIEBERMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Vanel Frenel	Art Unit 3626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31, 36-38 and 40-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31, 36-38 and 40-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/15/06 has been entered.

Notice to Applicant

2. This communication is in response to the RCE filed on 02/15/06. Claims 1, 13-15, 17-31, 36 and 40 have been amended. Claims 32-35, 39 and 44 have been cancelled. Claims 1-31, 36-38 and 40-43 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. 5. Claims 1-34, 36-38, and 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grimse et al (6,269,355), Computer-guided FMLA administration by Gary Meyer, May 1997) in view of Absence Mgr.com Upgraded to Account for Family Medical Leave Act Requirements, Web-Based Tool Helps Employers to Better Manage

Employee Absences by Deborah Kweiler (Business Editors, Business Wire; New YORK; Feb 16, 2000) and further in view of Kahn et al (6,401,079).

(A) As per claim 1, Grimse discloses a method for processing and tracking requests for leave under the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) (Col.9, lines 23-38) using a web-based computer system configured with at least one server which includes an employee FMLA database, the system including a plurality of client systems networked to the at least one server (See Grimse, Col.4, lines 29-67), said method comprising the steps of: displaying on a first client system at least one web page including FMLA leave request form (See Grimse, Col.4, , lines 41-67 to Col.5, line 20); prompting a requester to enter request data directly into the FMLA leave request form, the requester including at least one of an employee and a representative of the employee, the request data including information relating to a reason for a FMLA leave request, a name of the employee and a name of an employer, wherein the first system is associated with the requester (See Grimse, Col.1 1 , lines 13-38); automatically uploading the FMLA leave request form with request data from the first client system to the server, wherein the server is associated with the employer (Col.10, lines 35-67); determining, at the server, whether the employee is eligible to receive a conditional approval of the FMLA leave request form (See Grimse, Col.10, lines 58-67); automatically downloading the conditional approval from the server to the first client system for viewing by the requester; (Col.10, lines 42-67 to Col.1 1, line 38).

Grimse does not explicitly disclose displaying on the second client system at least one web page including the conditional approval and the medical certification form;

promptly the medical provider to enter medical data directly into the medical certification form displayed on the second client system, the medical data including a recommendation relating to the reason for the FMLA leave request; and transmitting from the server a final approval or disapproval to the requester at the first client system after performing the data comparison at the server.

However, these features are known as evidenced by Gary. In particular, Gary teaches promptly the medical provider to enter medical data directly into the medical certification form displayed on the second client system, the medical data includes a recommendation relating to the reason for the FMLA leave request (See Gary, Page 1, Paragraph 11 to Page 2, Paragraph 7), and downloading from the server a final approval or disapproval to the requester at the first client system (See Gary, Page 2, Paragraphs 2-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Gary within the system of Grimse with the motivation of providing a set of specific guidelines for notification periods, medical certification, return-to-work authorization and an early return from leave should be preceded by written notification and accompanied by a physician statement (See Gary, Page 1, Paragraph 11- Page 2, Paragraph 2).

Grimse and Gary do not explicitly disclose automatically downloading the conditional approval and a medical certification form to second client system associated with a medical provider identified by the requester; automatically uploading a completed medical certification form from the second client system to the server for storage in the

FMLA database', comparing, at the server, the request data to the medical data to determine whether the reason provided by the requester for the FMLA leave request corresponds with the recommendation provided by the medical provider.

However, these features are known as evidenced by Deborah. In particular, Deborah suggests automatically downloading the conditional approval and a medical certification form to second client system associated with a medical provider identified by the requester (Deborah, Page 2, Paragraph 1-9)., automatically uploading a completed medical certification form from the second client system to the server for storage in the FMLA database (Deborah, Page 2, Paragraph 1-9)', comparing, at the server, the request data to the medical data to determine whether the reason provided by the requester for the FMLA leave request corresponds with the recommendation provided by the medical provider (Deborah, Page 2, Paragraph 1-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Deborah within the collective teachings of Grimse and Gary with the motivation of providing a Web-based platform in which multiple employer sites can consistently quantify and monitor absence, while the information is automatically compiled and maintained on a real-time basis at a central location (See Deborah, Page 1, Paragraph 2).

Grimse, Gary and Deborah do not explicitly disclose that the method having automatically downloading the conditional approval and a medical certification form to a second client system associated with a medical provider identified by the requester.

However this feature is known in the art as evidenced by Kahn. In particular, Kahn suggests that the method having automatically downloading the conditional approval and a medical certification form to a second client system associated with a medical provider identified by the requester (See Kahn, Col.,47, lines 62-67 to Col.48, line 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Kahn within the collective teachings of Grimse, Gary and Deborah with the motivation of providing employers and employees (to the extent security policies permit) with a robust user interface via a standard web browser (See Kahn, Col.5, lines 13-16).

(B) As per claim 2, Gary discloses a method further comprising the step of tracking employee leaves, leave requests, and leave time remaining for employees under the Page 7 FMLA (See Gary, Page 2, Paragraphs 2-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary, Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(C) As per claim 3, Gary discloses a method wherein said step of automatically uploading the FMLA leave request form further comprises the step of uploading employee personal data and employee company data (See Gary, Page 2, Paragraphs 2-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary, Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(D) As per claim 4, Gary discloses a method wherein said step of automatically uploading the FMLA leave request form further comprises the step of uploading a reason for the requested medical leave (See Gary, Page 2, Paragraphs 2-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary, Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(E) As per claim 5, Gary discloses a method wherein said step of automatically uploading the FMLA leave request form further comprises the step of uploading a type of medical leave requested (See Gary, Page 2, Paragraphs 2-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary, Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(F) As per claim 6, Gary discloses a method wherein said step of automatically uploading the FMLA leave request form further comprises the step of completing the form on the requesting employees behalf (See Gary, Page 2, Paragraphs 2-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary,

Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(G) As per claim 7, Gary discloses a method wherein said step of automatically uploading a completed medical certification form further comprises the step of uploading a recommendation from the medical provider relating to the reason for the requested medical leave (See Gary, Page 2, Paragraphs 2-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary, Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(H) As per claim 8, Gary discloses a method wherein said step of uploading a recommendation from the medical provider relating to the reason for the requested medical leave further comprises the step of uploading a type of medical leave deemed appropriate by a medical care provider (See Gary, Page 2, Paragraphs 2-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary, Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(I) As per claim 9, Gary discloses a method wherein said step of automatically uploading a completed medical certification form further comprises the step of uploading medical care provider recommended dates and times for a leave (See Gary, Page 2,

Paragraphs 2-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary, Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(J) As per claim 10, Gray discloses a method wherein said step of automatically uploading a completed medical certification form further comprises the step of uploading a signature stamp of a medical care provider (See Gary, Page 2, Paragraphs 2-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary, Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(K) As per claim 11, Grimse discloses a method wherein said step of automatically uploading an initial FMLA leave request form further comprises the step of accepting FMLA leave request information over a telephone by at least one of a voice responsive system where a user enters spoken FMLA information and a menu system where a user enters requested FMLA information using the touch keys of a telephone (The Examiner interprets internet to be a medium that include a telephone See Grimse, Col.10, lines 15-41).

(L) As per claim 12, Grimse discloses a method wherein said step of automatically uploading a completed medical certification form further comprises the step of accepting

FMLA information over a telephone by at least one of a voice responsive system where a medical care provider enters spoken FMLA recommendation information and a menu system where a medical care provider enters an FMLA recommendation using the touch keys of a telephone (Col.9, lines 23-67 to Col.10, line 57).

(M) As per claim 13, Grimse discloses a system for facilitating processing and tracking of requests under the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA), said system comprising: at least one computer (See Grimse, Col.4, lines 41-62), a first computer associated with a requester, the requester including at least one of an employee and a representative of the employee (See Grimse, Col.4, lines 41-62) a second computer associated with a medical provider identified by the requester (Col.7, lines 41-67 to Col.8, line 28); a server associated with an employer further comprising: an employee FMLA request database (Col.4, lines 29-67 to Col.5, line 67; Col.9, lines 23-67 to Col.10, line 67), a network connecting said servers to said computers, said server configured (Col.4, lines 41-62) to: display on the first computer the plurality of said form including a FMLA leave request form (See Grimse, Col.4, lines 41-67 to Col.5, line 20), prompt the requester to enter request data directly into the FMLA leave request form including information relating to a reason for a FMLA leave request, a name of the employee and a name of the employer, receive the FMLA leave request form with the leave data from the first computer, determine whether the employee is eligible to receive a conditional approval of the FMLA leave request form (See Grimse, Col.4, lines 41-67 to Col.5, line 20).

Grimse does not explicitly disclose promptly the medical provider to enter medical data directly into the medical certification form displayed on the second computer, the medical data including a recommendation relating to the reason for the FMLA leave request; and transmit a final approval or disapproval to the requester at the first computer after performing the data comparison.

However, these features are known as evidenced by Gary. In particular, Gary teaches promptly the medical provider to enter medical data directly into the medical certification form displayed on the second computer, the medical data including a recommendation relating to the reason for the FMLA leave request (See Gary, Page 1 , Paragraph 1 1 to Page 2, Paragraph 7); and transmit a final approval or disapproval to the requester at the first computer after performing the data comparison (See Gary, Page 2, Paragraphs 2-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Gary within the system of Grimse with the motivation of providing a set of specific guidelines for notification periods, medical certification, return-to-work authorization and an early return from leave should be preceded by written notification and accompanied by a physician statement (See Gary, Page 1, Paragraph 11- Page 2, Paragraph 2).

Grimse and Gary do not explicitly disclose automatically download the conditional approval to the first computer for viewing by the requester, automatically download the conditional approval and a medical certification form to the second computer, receive a completed medical certification from the second computer

for storage in the FMLA database, compare the request data to the medical data to determine whether the reason provided by the requester for the FMLA leave request corresponds with the recommendation provided by the medical provider.

However, these features are known as evidenced by Deborah. In particular, Deborah suggests automatically download the conditional approval to the first computer for viewing by the requester (See Deborah, Page 2, Paragraphs 1-9), automatically download the conditional approval and a medical certification form to the second computer (See Deborah, Page 2, Paragraphs 1-9); receive a completed medical certification from the second computer for storage in the FMLA database, compare the request data to the medical data to determine whether the reason provided by the requester for the FMLA leave request corresponds with the recommendation provided by the medical provider (See Deborah, Page 2, Paragraph 1-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Deborah within the collective teachings of Grimse and Gary with the motivation of providing a Web-based platform in which multiple employer sites can consistently quantify and monitor absence, while the information is automatically compiled and maintained on a real-time basis at a central location (See Deborah, Page 1, Paragraph 2).

Grimse, Gary and Deborah do not explicitly disclose that the system having displaying on the second computer the conditional approval and the medical certification form.

However this feature is known in the art as evidenced by Kahn. In particular, Kahn suggests that the method having displaying on the second computer the conditional approval and the medical certification form (See Kahn, Col.,47, lines 62-67 to Col.48, line 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Kahn within the collective teachings of Grimse, Gary and Deborah with the motivation of providing employers and employees (to the extent security policies permit) with a robust user interface via a standard web browser (See Kahn, Col.5, lines 13-16).

(N) As per claim 14, Grimse discloses a system wherein said server and said computers are configured to allow the requester to submit the leave request via the Internet (Col.4, lines 41-67).

(O) As per claim 15, Grimse discloses a system wherein said sever and said computers are configured to allow the requester to submit the leave request via an Intranet (Col.4, lines 41-67).

(P) As per claim 16, Grimse discloses a system wherein said network is one of a wide area network and a local area network (Col .4, lines 41-67).

Art Unit: 3626

(Q) As per claim 17, Gary discloses a system wherein said server is further configured to track employee leaves, leave requests, and leave time remaining for employees under the FMLA (Page 2, Paragraphs 3-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary, Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1 and 13, and incorporated herein.

(R) As per claim 18, Gary discloses a system said server is further configured to upload and store in said database employee leave requests (Page 2, Paragraphs 3-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary, Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1 and 13, and incorporated herein.

(S) As per claim 19, Gary discloses a system wherein said server is further configured to upload and store employee personal data and employee company data (Page 2, Paragraphs 3-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary, Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1 and 13, and incorporated herein.

(T) As per claim 20, Gary discloses a system wherein said server is further configured to upload and store a reason for the requested medical

leave (Page 2, Paragraphs 3-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary, Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1 and 13, and incorporated herein.

(U) As per claim 21, Gary discloses a system wherein said server is further configured to upload and store a type of medical leave requested (Page 2, Paragraphs 3-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary, Deborah are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1 and 13, and incorporated herein.

(V) As per claim 22, Gary discloses a system wherein said server is further configured to allow a third person to upload a leave request form on the requesting employees behalf (Page 2, Paragraphs 3-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary and Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1 and 13, and incorporated herein.

(W) As per claim 23, Gary discloses a system wherein said server is further configured to upload a completed medical certification form (Page 2, Paragraphs 3-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary,

Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1 and 13, and incorporated herein.

(X) As per claim 24, Gary discloses a system wherein said server is further configured to upload a reason for the requested medical leave (Page 2, Paragraphs 3-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary, Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claims land 13, and incorporated herein.

(Y) As per claim 25, Gary discloses a system according to Claim 24 wherein said server is further configured to upload a type of medical leave deemed appropriate by a medical care provider (Page 2, Paragraphs 3-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary, Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1 and 13, and incorporated herein.

(Z) As per claim 26, Gary discloses a system wherein said server is further configured to upload medical care provider recommended dates and times for a leave (Page 2, Paragraphs 3-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary,

Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1 and 13, and incorporated herein.

(AA) As per claim 27, Gary discloses a system wherein said server is further configured to upload a signature stamp of a medical care provider (Page 2, Paragraphs 3-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary, Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1 and 13, and incorporated herein.

(BB) As per claim 28, Gary discloses a system wherein said server is configured to download a medical certification form to a named medical care provider (Page 2, Paragraphs 3-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary, Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1 and 13, and incorporated herein.

(CC) As per claim 29, Gary discloses a system wherein said server is configured to send to an employee at least one of a conditional approval and a medical certification form to an employee requesting leave (Page 2, Paragraphs 3-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary,

Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1 and 13, and incorporated herein.

(DD) As per claim 30, Gary discloses a system wherein said server is configured to accept FMLA leave request information over a telephone by at least one of a voice responsive system where a user enters spoken FMLA information and a menu system where a user enters requested FMLA information using the touch keys of a telephone (Page 2, Paragraphs 3-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary, Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1 and 13, and incorporated herein.

(EE) As per claim 31, Grimse discloses a system wherein said server is configured to accept FMLA information over a telephone by at least one of a voice responsive system where a medical care provider enters spoken FMLA recommendation information and a menu system where a medical care provider enters an FMLA recommendation using the touch keys of a telephone (Col.9, lines 23-67 to Col.10, line 57).

(FF) Claim 36 recites the same limitations as claim 1 above, and is therefore rejected for the same reasons, and incorporated herein.

(GG) As per claim 37, Gary discloses apparatus wherein said means for

storing a plurality of FMLA forms and said means for storing employee FMLA requests comprises at least one server (Page 3, Paragraph 5).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse, Gary, Deborah and Kahn are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1, 13, and 36, and incorporated herein.

(HH) As per claim 38, Gary discloses apparatus wherein said servers is further configured to track employee leaves, leave requests, and leave time remaining for employees under the FMLA (Page 2, Paragraph 3).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse and Gary are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1, 13, and 36, and incorporated herein.

(II) Claim 40 recites the same limitations as claim 1 above, except a code segment which clearly teaches by Grimse ((See Figs.6-11 such as help (AMH 0001 in Fig.6 element (130) etc.)), and is therefore rejected for the same reasons, and incorporated herein.

(JJ) As per claim 41, Gary discloses a computer readable medium further comprising employee personal data and employee company data (Page 2, Paragraphs 3-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse and Gary are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1, 13, 36 and 40, and incorporated

herein.

(KK) As per claim 42, Gary discloses a computer readable medium further comprising a record of a reason for the requested medical leave (Page 2, Paragraph 7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse and Gary are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1, 13, 32, and 36 and 40, and incorporated herein.

(LL) As per claim 43, Gary discloses a computer readable medium further comprising a record of completed medical certification forms (Page 2, Paragraph 7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Grimse and Gary are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1, 13, and 36 and 40, and incorporated herein.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited but not the applied art teaches method and system for remotely managing business and employee administration functions (2002/0022982).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vanel Frenel whose telephone number is 571-272-6769. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am-5:00pm.

Art Unit: 3626

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 571-272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

V.F
V.F


JOSEPH THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

March 3, 2006